

To: Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA;"Michael.G.Nepstad@" [usace.army.mil
Michael.G.Nepstad@usace.army.mil]; Michael.G.Nepstad@" [usace.army.mil
Michael.G.Nepstad@usace.army.mil]; Robershotte, Paul J SPD"
[Paul.J.Robershotte@usace.army.mil]; Nawi, David" [David_Nawi@ios.doi.gov]
Cc: "Morrow, Michelle M" [mmmmorrow@water.ca.gov];
Deanna.Harwood@noaa.gov>;"Monroe, James" [James.Monroe@sol.doi.gov]; Monroe, James"
[James.Monroe@sol.doi.gov]; Allen, Kaylee" [Kaylee.Allen@sol.doi.gov]; aren
Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA[]
From: "Nepstad, Michael G SPK"
Sent: Wed 8/24/2011 8:16:26 PM
Subject: RE: BDCP 404 MOU - New Version - Are we finished? (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

There will be a few changes by SPK. I will send it out after I get my
counsel to review. I will let you all know when there is a new version.

-----Original Message-----

From: Hagler.Tom@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Hagler.Tom@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2011 9:49 AM
To: Michael.G.Nepstad@; Robershotte, Paul J SPD; Nawi, David
Cc: Morrow, Michelle M; Deanna.Harwood@noaa.gov; Monroe, James; Allen,
Kaylee; Schwinn.Karen@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: BDCP 404 MOU - New Version - Are we finished?

To the federal team listed above -

Michelle Morrow has confirmed that the 404 MOU has been reviewed by
the contractors without comment, and that DWR is ready to sign the attached
version.

In the last version I sent to the federal team, there were a couple
of "questions" to be answered. Here is how we answered them in this version:

(1) Page 4, last paragraph before Section II "Overview". The Corps had
asked to take out the last two sentences on extending the MOU approach for
subsequent BDCP projects. We have left that sentence in there, because it
reflects the position of the agencies and is conditional, not binding.

(2) Page 5, Section III, numbered paragraph one. DWR had suggested
alternative language. We have not made that change. This revised language
raised the issue of the scope of the MOU at this time (which the Corps has
emphasized is the site-specific permit for the New Conveyance facilities).

(3) Page 7, par. 5.a. DWR suggested change that we have not made. This
change raised the same issue as in number 2.

I think we have agreed to all of the other changes reflected in this
DWR draft. I note that the DWR draft here is very close to the redline I
sent out earlier.

To wrap this up, I suggest:

(a) Federal agencies need to confirm this draft. The only outstanding issue I recall is that the Corps may need to think about who (which level) should be signing this MOU. Make that change on your own. Please let me know ASAP whether this version is acceptable to your agencies.

(b) I would like to ask the Corps to prepare a final, signature version (take out the underlinings, put in a date, take out the draft headings, etc.) and circulate it to everyone on the list above.

(c) Michelle - If I'm missing something, let me know ASAP.

- Tom (415-972-3945)

----- Forwarded by Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US on 08/24/2011 09:27 AM -----

From: "Morrow, Michelle M" <mmorrow@water.ca.gov>
To: Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 08/19/2011 09:33 AM
Subject: MOU status

Hi Tom

I left you a voicemail message. Attached is the last version I have to move forward with finalizing.

When you get back in the office please finalize on the federal side.

Thanks for all you help!

Michelle

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE